Project Leader Approval Checklist

N-number of this completed checklist: ISO TC184/SC4/WG3N1060

Name of person who completed this checklist Glen Ziolko

Date this checklist was completed 12/3/2001

Document reviewed

Standard ISO 10303

Part 232

Edition 1st

Stage 6

N-number: ISO TC184/SC4/WG3 N1066

Requirements for approving and submitting to the Secretariat documents at any stage of approval may be found at http://www.nist.gov/sc4/www/stdsumm.htm.

The current versions of supporting documents for SC4 part developers may be found at http://www.nist.gov/sc4/www/necsdocs.htm.

For each question, check the box that applies. If "N/A" (not applicable) is checked, explain the reason the question is not applicable in the comment field.

PROJECT TEAM REVIEW

YES	NO	N/A		
☒	☐	☐	1.	Members of the project team and reviewers are adequately trained to perform the roles they are assigned. Comments: Jesse Crusey - Internal Review. David Campbell - Compile and debug express
☒	☐	☐	2.	The completed internal review documents submitted by the project team to the project leader are dated and signed by the project team member assigned to Quality Committee and the person who performed the review. Comments: Signed by Jesse Crusey Comments/Resolutions to No response in Internal review document; 125. No terms Identified. 212. The Application Experts requested the Base Types be included in the Express-G diagrams for both the ARM and the AIM. 239. Used dash lines which follows the IDEF0 methodology. Built diagrams for this AP at least 6 or 7 years ago. At that time this was the SC4 process. Application experts feel comfortable with dash lines. Dash lines are much clearer to the reader. 254. They are indicated with dash lines as stated in the openig paragraph of F.3

YES	NO	N/A		
☒	☐	☐	3.	The project team has used the task assignments from QC Procedures for Internal Review. The N-number of the version used is QC N110.

☒ All applicable tasks are completed for the part class as stated in Table 1 of Procedures for Internal Review.

☐ Some tasks were omitted because they were unclear or did not apply. Feedback regarding improvements to the Procedures for Internal Review was sent to the QC exploder (qc@cme.nist.gov).

Comments:

☒	☐	☐	4.	The project team, in the summary report, has collected, reviewed, and recorded all SEDS that affect project development.

Comments: Related SEDS are in Annex C of the Validation Report

☒	☐	☐	5.	All issues and errors identified in the internal review have been resolved or recorded.

☒ All issues have been resolved and are closed.

☐ Issues remain open and are documented in the internal review summary report.

Comments: All issue identified in the Internal Review Checklist have be addressed.

PART STAGE

☒	☐	☐	6.	This part is at stage:

☒ Stage 6 (IS).

☐ Stage 5 (FDIS).

☐ Stage 4 (DIS).

☐ Stage 3 (CD).

☐ Stage 2 (WD) Industry Review.

Comments:

ISSUE LOG

☒	☐	☐	7.	The issue log is up-to-date for the stage of the part:

☐ At Stage 3, there is evidence of active issue resolution (open issues are permitted).

☐ At Stage 4, there are no open technical issues (though there may be open editorial issues).

☒ At Stage 5, there are no open issues.

Comments:

☒	☐	☐	8.	The issue log is in the proper format for the stage of the part:

☐ At Stage 3, the issue log is legible, easy to read, and complete.

☒ At Stage 4 and Stage 5, the issue resolutions are recorded using ISO Form 13B. *(See http://www.nist.gov/sc4/forms/form13b/.)*

Comments:

COPYRIGHT

If the part is at Stage 4 or beyond, check the following items:

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	9. The copyright symbol and statement are on the bottom of page ii. They are correct and as specified by the Supplementary Directives for the Drafting and Presentation of ISO 10303 (SD). *(See 4.2.2 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	10. The correct copyright symbol is on page 1, and it is as specified by the SD. *(See 4.1.4 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	11. Each page of the document has the correct page header with the copyright symbol as specified by the SD. *(See 4.1.1 of the SD.)* Comments:

COVER PAGE

☒	☐	☐	12. The cover page has the correct format, structure, and content. *(See 4.2.1, annex A of the SD, http://www.nist.gov/sc4/editing/cover, and http://www.nist.gov/sc4/editing/cover/cov_read.htm.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	13. The N-number is present, identifies a unique document, and matches the WG document log. ☐ The document is the initial publication; the "Supersedes" field is blank. ☒ The document has been released previously; the "Supersedes" field contains the N-number of the last published version. Comments: N955 was the supersedes one
☒	☐	☐	14. The date is present with the format YYYY-MM-DD. *(See http://www.nist.gov/sc4/editing/cover/cov_read.htm.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	15. The part number and title have been verified with the SC4 Secretariat as being the same as that registered by TC 184/SC4 for the project. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	16. The title matches the title listed by the SC4 Secretariat and registered with ISO for the project. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	17. The ballot stage and ballot cycle are indicated. *(See http://www.nist.gov/sc4/editing/cover/cov_read.htm.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	18. The abstract is present, concise, unambiguous, supports the scope of the part, does not arbitrarily introduce new wording beyond that in the scope statement. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	19. The keywords are appropriate for searches by interested parties. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	20. The Project Leader and Part Editor are specified and are as recorded by TC184/SC4; names, addresses, telephone/FAX numbers, and e-mail addresses are present. Comments:

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	21. The "Comments to Reader" field contains the required text and other text appropriate for the audience of the part during this ballot cycle. *(See http://www.nist.gov/sc4/editing/cover/cov_read.htm.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	22. The "Copyright Notice" field of the cover contains the required text for the ballot release Stage of the part. *(See http://www.nist.gov/sc4/editing/cover/cov_read.htm.)* NOTE: WD and CD copyright statements are different than DIS and FDIS. Comments:

CONTENTS, ANNEXES, FIGURES, AND TABLES

☒	☐	☐	23. The Table of Contents (TOC) starts on page iii (right-hand side of the document) as specified by the SD. *(See 4.2.2 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	24. The TOC is complete and contains the information as specified by the SD. *(See 4.2.2 and 8.1of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	25. All figures and tables have a title and are presented in the format as specified by the SD. *(See 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	26. The Index is present and starts on the page specified by the TOC as specified by the SD. *(See 4.2. of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	27. There are no font sizes smaller that 2.5mm in height or 8pt size appear in any of the text, diagrams, figures, or tables as specified by the SD. *(See 4.1.3 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	28. All notes and examples in the text of the document appear as specified in the SD. *(See 4.5.3 and 4.5.4 of the SD.)* Comments:

FOREWORD AND INTRODUCTION

☒	☐	☐	29. The Foreword starts on a new page and the required text is as specified by the SD. *(See 4.2.3.2 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	30. The list of parts documented in the Foreword is current. For 10303 parts reference SOLIS at http://www.nist.gov/sc4/editing/step/titles and as specified by the SD. *(See 4.2.3.2 of the SD.)* The titles were downloaded from SOLIS on 2000-08-20 (date). Comments:
☒	☐	☐	31. The Introduction starts on a new page. *(See 4.2.4 of the SD and 6.1.4 of ISO/IEC Directives Part 3:1997.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	32. The Introduction states the required knowledge-base necessary for understanding this part. Comments:

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	33. The Introduction explains the industry need for this part and does not imply a broader or narrower focus of types of information covered than specified by the Scope statement. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	34. The Introduction states the purpose of this part and is unambiguous, concise, and understandable. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	35. The Introduction identifies the application domain for using this part. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	36. Relationships with other parts under SC4 control have been identified and referenced within this part as specified by the SD. *(See 4.2.4 of the SD.)* Comments:

SCOPE

☒	☐	☐	37. The Scope for the part begins on page 1 (right-hand side of the document) and the format of the page is correct as specified by the SD, including the header that is different from all other page headers for the part. *(See 4.1.4 and 4.3.1.1 of the SD, and QC N151.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	38. The required text is as specified by the SD. *(See 4.3.1.2., 6.2, 7.1, and 8.2 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	39. The Scope statement is complete and defines the extent of the subject matter as specified by the SD *(See 4.3.1.2., 6.2, 7.1, and 8.2 of the SD and for APs 4.1 of Guidelines for the development and approval of STEP application protocols (APG).)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	40. Types of data supported are easily identifiable from the Scope statement. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	41. Discipline views that are supported are easily identifiable from the Scope statement. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	42. Life-cycle stages supported are easily identifiable from the Scope statement. Comments: x
☒	☐	☐	43. Types of data not supported are easily identifiable from the Scope statement. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	44. Discipline views that are not supported are easily identifiable from the Scope statement. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	45. Life-cycle stages not supported are easily identifiable from the Scope statement. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	46. All in-scope and out-of-scope aspects of the part are identified and properly separated as specified by the SD. *(See 4.3.1.2 of the SD.)* Comments:

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	47. The scope as stated in the original New Work Item for this part: ☐ has been increased. A New Work Item will be initiated on _____ (date). ☐ has been decreased. A New Work Item will be initiated on _____ (date). ☐ is affected by a SEDS report. The SEDS report(s) are: _____ (date). ☒ is unchanged. Comments:
☐	☐	☒	48. The working group convener and the SC4 Secretariat have been notified of the Scope changes by this Project Leader: ☐ Yes. The notification occurred on _____ (date). ☐ The Scope is unchanged. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	49. The Scope statement is complete, concise, unambiguous, and conveys the extent of the part in terms that are understandable to an engineering user, an application domain expert, and a software implementor. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	50. No user requirements or definitions appear in the scope statement as specified by the SD and ID3. *(See 4.6 of the SD and 6.6.6 of ISO/IEC Directives Part 3:1997.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	51. All issues related to the Scope have been resolved. Comments:

NORMATIVE REFERENCES

☒	☐	☐	52. All standards and technical specifications referenced in normative text (including other SC4 standards) have been identified in clause 2 as specified by the SD. *(See 4.3.1.3, 6.3, 7.2, and 8.3 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	53. References to normative sources are only found in the normative text of this part. No normative references appear in NOTEs, EXAMPLEs, or informative annexes. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	54. If this part is at Stage 4 (DIS) or higher, all ISO standards normatively referenced are also at Stage 4, or higher. Comments:

DEFINITIONS, SYMBOLS, AND ABBREVIATIONS

☒	☐	☐	55. All terms used in this part from other ISO standards (including TC 184/SC4 parts) are listed under a subclause for each part or standard in clause 3 as specified by the SD. *(See 4.3.2.1 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	56. All definitions of terms that conflict with current definitions of the same term(s) defined in other TC 184/SC4 parts have been defined in clause 3. A NOTE has been included with the definition to alert the reader of the difference. Comments:

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	57. Terms specific to the application domain of this part that are not found in other publicly available standards have been identified and defined in clause 3.x, "Other terms and definitions." Comments:
☒	☐	☐	58. Terms defined in "Other terms and definitions" are unambiguous, concise, and understandable to the end-user of this part. All defined terms have non-circular definitions. A definition is considered circular when the term being defined appears in the definition. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	59. All abbreviations are recorded in a subclause in clause 3 as specified by the SD. Note: Abbreviations are strongly discouraged in ISO parts. When they are permitted, document them as specified by the SD. *(See 4.3.2.2 of the SD.)* Comments:

EXPRESS

☒	☐	☐	60. The EXPRESS schemas within this part have been successfully compiled. The compilers and versions used were the following: (Suggestion: use multiple compilers.)

Compiler	Version	Platform
ECCO	v 2.3.0	Windows95 / GNU gcc compiler
EPM EXPRESSDataManager	Version 4.041	NT 4.00
STEPTools, ST-Developer	date: Nov 2001	On STEPTools web server.

Comments: The EPM and STEPTools compilers ran through schema without any errors or warnings. The ECCO compiler ran through the schema catching 9 errors and some warnings. The errors occurred in an entity from AIC 517 and an entity from AIC 518. SEDS issues were submitted and the proposed solutions incorporated into the AP 232 schema. The errors were within the WHERE rules in those entities. The STEPTools Inc compilier found an error in AIC 505. A SEDS issues was submitted and the proposed solution incorporated into the AP 232 schema.

☒	☐	☐	61. There is a one-to-one correspondence for each EXPRESS entity and type between the schema and the EXPRESS-G diagrams. Comments:

AAM (ISO 10303 AP ONLY)

☒	☐	☐	62. All inputs, controls, outputs, mechanisms (ICOMs), and activities this part defines and their definitions are sufficient for the domain expert and software implementor as specified by the SD and APG. *(See 8.8.2.1.1 of the SD and 4.7 of the APG.)* Comments:
☐	☒	☐	63. All out-of-scope activities and ICOMs are identified and are indicated with an asterisks as specified by the SD. *(See 8.8.2.1.1 and 8.8.2.1.2 of the SD and 4.7 of the APG.)* Comments: * used in definitions, dash lines used on diagrams to indicate out-of-scope
☒	☐	☐	64. Each in-scope activities and ICOMs are traceable to the scope. *(See clause 5 of the APG.)* Comments:

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	65. The entire AAM has been reviewed, is understood, and is approved by appropriate industry experts. Evidence to support this approval is documented in the AP Validation Report as required by the APG. *(See 5.6 and 5.6.1 of the APG.)* Comments:

APPLICATION REFERENCE MODEL (ISO 10303 AP ONLY)

☒	☐	☐	66. The Introduction for this part contains a data planning model as specified by the APG. *(See clause 4 of the APG.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	67. All units of functionality (UOFs) are defined and have been reviewed, are understood, and are approved by appropriate industry experts as required by the APG. *(See clauses 4 and 5 of the APG.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	68. Each UOF has a name appropriate for its functionality and is unique across the set of UOFs and application objects (AOs) in this part as specified by the SD and the APG. *(See 8.5.1 of the SD and 4.4.1 and 5.3 of the APG.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	69. All UOFs are within the scope of this part. Comments:
☒	☐	☒	70. UOF harmonization, with other ISO 10303 parts with similar UOF requirements and identical UOF names, is complete. ☒ None apply ☐ UOFs used from other APs are listed below. UOFs used: Comments:
☒	☐	☐	71. There is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of AOs listed in the UOFs in clause 4.1 and the set of AOs defined in clause 4.2. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	72. All application objects (AO) are defined, have been reviewed, are understood, and are approved by appropriate industry experts. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	73. There is a one-to-one correspondence between the AOs defined in clause 4 and the ARM diagrams in annex G of this part. Comments:
☐	☒	☐	74. Each AO name is unique across the set of 10303 application protocols and does not share its name with an attribute name or UOF name within this part. An exception to this rule is management resource subtypes. The following parts/subtype names are shared: UoF &AO same names (Parts_list, Data_list, Index_llist, Indentured_data_list, Data_definition_exchange, Product_data_set, Drawing) Comments: Above are common in AP 232
☒	☐	☐	75. No integrated resource (IR) term or definition is found in the information requirements clause except by written request from the industry review experts to which this application protocol is designed to assist. Comments: effectivity is an example

YES	NO	N/A	

MAPPING TABLE (ISO 10303 AP ONLY)

☒	☐	☐	76. Interpretation of the ARM has been performed by qualified resources. The interpretation was performed by the following individuals: Comments:
☒	☐	☐	77. The complete interpretation report is included with the AP Validation Report as required the APG. *(See 5.4.1 and 5.6.1 of the APG.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	78. All pruning is identified and the rationale for why such pruning is required is documented in subclause 5.2.1 Fundamental concepts and assumptions of this part as specified by the APG. *(See 4.5 and 5.4 of the APG.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	79. Each application element (AE), attribute and assertion from clause 4 appears at least once in the mapping table. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	80. Each source specified in the mapping table is accurate for the reference path stated and is according to the Guidelines for the development of mapping tables (MTG), APG, and SD. *(See document MTG, 4.5 of the APG and 8.6 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	81. Each rule in the mapping table is found in clause 5.2.n and is identified at the end of the mapping table. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	82. Each AE has a complete entry in the "reference path" column of the mapping table. The phrases "NO MAPPING" or "PARTIAL MAPPING" do not appear in the mapping table of this part. Comments:

AIM SHORT FORM (ISO 10303 AP AND AIC ONLY)

☒	☐	☐	83. The schema and entity information in the USE FROM statements in the short form and the "source" and "reference path" in the mapping table agree with the integrated resources. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	84. The USE FROM statements appear at the beginning of the schema and are identified to the IR from which they come as specified by the SD. *(See 8.6.2 of the SD.)* Comments:
☒	☐	☐	85. AIC requirements are satisfied for this part. ☒ The appropriate AICs have been correctly referenced and used. ☐ No AIC(s) is/are required. Comments:
☐	☐	☒	86. New AIC(s) is/are under development as a New Work Item. Comments:
☒	☐	☐	87. The short form contains all application-specific entities, rules, and functions. Comments:

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	88. The short form has been compiled. The compilers and versions used were the following: (Suggestion: use multiple compilers.)

Compiler	Version	Platform
EDM	4.041 April 19, 2001	NT

Comments:

CONFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS (ISO 10303 AP ONLY)

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	89. Each conformance class is identified in a table in clause 6 as specified by the SD and the APG. *(See 8.7 of the SD and 4.6 and 5.5 of the APG.)*

Comments:

REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION (ISO 10303 AP ONLY)

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	90. The Validation Report is complete for the stage of the part in question as required by the APG. *(See 5.6 of the APG.)*

Comments:

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	91. Annex L contains usage scenarios and usage tests for the part as specified by the SD and the APG. The Usage Scenario aneex is optional but you are strongly encouraged to include it. *(See 8.8.3 of the SD and 4.7 5.6.1 of the APG.)*

☒ Yes. The usage scenarios reflect the scope of the part.

☐ No. Convener and project team have agreed that usage scenarios are not needed at this stage for this part.

Comments: The usage scenarios are in annex K.

YES	NO	N/A	
☐	☐	☒	92. There is an annex containing technical discussions about this part (Annex M if there is a Usage Scenarios annex; Annex L otherwise). The technical discussions annex is optional, but you are strongly encouraged to include it. *(See 8.8.3.2 of the SD and 4.7 of the APG.)*

☐ Yes. The Technical Discussion annex is concise and contains useful and clarifying information about this part.

☐ No. The convener and project leader have agreed that technical discussions are not needed at this stage for this part.

Comments: Detail technical descussions that are not handled in 5.2 or Annex K will be addressed in the Recommended Usage Guide

YES	NO	N/A	
☒	☐	☐	93. The Abstract Test Suite that corresponds to this part is appropriately complete for the part's stage:

☐ At Stage 3, the test purposes are in work.

☐ At Stage 5, the abstract test suite is complete.

Comments: Boeing has compled test cases for conformance classes PL, and IDL. Lockheed Martin have test cases in-work for the DDE conformance class.

APPROVAL

I have reviewed and verified the items on this document.

YES NO N/A

Glen Ziolko	Augu st 18, 2001
Name	Date